

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/614,118

Applicant(s)

CANNELL ET AL.

Examiner

Humera N. Sheikh

Art Unit

1615

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Humera N. Sheikh.

(3) Anthony TRIDICO *AT*

(2) Ali Ahmed. *AA*

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 January 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wisotzki et al. (USPN 4,900,545).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed Wisotzki ('545) reference and *(4)*

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

(4) indicated that xulose is disclosed however it is not a preferred sugar. Applicants directed Examiner to instant specification - Example 4, Tables 13 & 14. Applicants response will be reviewed for the determination of allowability.

/Humera N. Sheikh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615